UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

———————

No. 03-6159

———————

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

                                    Plaintiff - Appellee,

        versus

SHERRELL GARY BRINKLEY,

                                    Defendant - Appellant.

———————

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western
District of North Carolina, at Charlotte. Graham C. Mullen, Chief
District Judge. (CR-91-131-P, CA-02-301-3-2-MU)

———————

Submitted: June 30, 2003   Decided: July 10, 2003

———————

Before WILKINSON, WILLIAMS, and MICHAEL, Circuit Judges.

———————

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

———————

Sherell Gary Brinkley, Appellant Pro Se. Jennifer Marie Hoefling,
Assistant United States Attorney, Asheville, North Carolina, for
Appellee.

———————

PER CURIAM:

Sherrell Gary Brinkley, a federal prisoner, seeks to appeal the district court's order denying relief on his petition filed under 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2000). An appeal may not be taken from the final order in a § 2255 proceeding unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1) (2000). A certificate of appealability will not issue for claims addressed by a district court absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2000). A prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find both that his constitutional claims are debatable and that any dispositive procedural rulings by the district court are also debatable or wrong. See Miller-El v Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 123 S. Ct. 1029, 1040 (2003); Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); Rose v. Lee, 252 F.3d 676, 683 (4th Cir.), cert. denied, 534 U.S. 941 (2001). We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Brinkley has not made the requisite showing. Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED